

## AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.116

Serial Number: 09/783,771

Filing Date: February 14, 2001

Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR PROVIDING SOFTWARE COMPATIBILITY IN A PROCESSOR ARCHITECTURE

Page 7  
Dkt: P10925**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks and the above amendments. This response is believed to fully address all issues raised in the Office Action mailed May 17, 2007. Furthermore, no new matter is believed to have been introduced hereby.

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 12-15, 17-19, and 21-29 were previously pending. Claims 1, 10, 19, and 25 have been amended as detailed above. Claims 30-33 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 12-15, 17-19, and 21-33 remain pending.

**35 USC §§102 and 103 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 1, 3-6, 10, 12-15, 19, 21, and 23-26 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Juffa (U.S. Patent No. 6,247,117).

Claims 8, 9, 17, 18, 22, and 27-29 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Juffa (U.S. Patent No. 6,247,117) in view of common knowledge in the art.

Each of these rejections is respectfully traversed.

Without limiting the scope of embodiments of the invention, only in an effort to impart precision to the claims (e.g., by more particularly pointing out embodiments of the invention, rather than to avoid prior art), and merely to expedite the prosecution of the present application, Applicant has amended all pending independent claims as detailed above.

In particular, Juffa appears to be generally related to a check instruction that is used to detect special cases from operand values (see, e.g., Juffa's abstract or summary) and not the bit(s) of a control register that indicate a processor's capabilities. Hence, Juffa fails to anticipate (or even suggest) the claimed combination of features such as set forth in the pending independent claims. Moreover, per Examiner's suggestion, additional language has been provided to distinguish over Juffa.

Also, all pending dependent claims should be allowable for at least similar reasons as their respective independent claims, as well as additional or alternative elements that are recited therein but not shown in the cited prior art. For example, per Examiner's suggestion in the outstanding Office Action, the new claims 30-33 also include further details regarding the memory image and task switching have been provided to further distinguish over the cited art.

## AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.116

Serial Number: 09/783,771

Filing Date: February 14, 2001

Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR PROVIDING SOFTWARE COMPATIBILITY IN A PROCESSOR ARCHITECTURE

Page 8  
Dkt: P10925Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (720-840-6740) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-4238.

Respectfully submitted,

Customer Number: 50890

Telephone Number: 720-840-6740

Date July 17, 2007By /Ramin Aghevli/  
Ramin Aghevli  
Reg. No. 43,462